

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Long P. Nguyen

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-26 are now pending in this application, with claims 1, 12 and 23 being independent claims. Claims 12, 24, 25 and 26 have been amended, while claim 13 has been canceled.

Regarding 35 USC 112 Rejections

In the present official action, claims 24, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants have amended these claims pursuant to Examiner's recommendation. In particular claims 24, 25 and 26 have been amended to depend from independent claim 23. Applicants respectfully assert that these claims as now presented overcome these rejections. Therefore, Applicants request that these rejections be withdrawn.

In The Claims

In the present official action, independent claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US Patent No. 6,567,408). Applicants have amended independent claims 12 and respectfully assert that claims 1 and 12 as now presented are not anticipated by Li. In particular, claim 1 includes the element of "selecting an action from a plurality of actions based on the first index *and* the second index, each action being associated with two or more indices of the plurality of indices" (emphasis added), while claim 12 includes the element "a memory device, operatively coupled to the index allocator, comprising a plurality of action, *each* being selected based on *two* or more indices from the plurality of indices" (emphasis added).

In contrast, as pointed out by the Examiner, Li discloses selection an action only based upon one of the indices, not both (see Li, column 10, lines 33-35) "Table 60 has a pointer 66 corresponding to *the* entry or 116.190.*.* which points to the second level table 62B." Clearly, in Li, the action is based only upon which index is chosen, not upon both. As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Li, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Long P. Nguyen

In the present official action, independent claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yazaki et al. (US Patent No. 6,768,738). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and assert that 23 is not anticipated by Yazaki. In particular, claim 23 includes the element of "*generating* a first string from source information associated with the PDU" (emphasis added).

In contrast, as pointed out by the Examiner, Yazaki does not disclose "generating a first string" as the present invention claims, rather discloses utilizing existing header information, and not generating a first string "whether the *header* information. ." (Yazaki, column 15, lines 38-40). As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Yazaki, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 23 is patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2-11, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of claims 14-22, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 12, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of claims 24-26, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 23, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 23, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616
Examiner: Long P. Nguyen

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned attorney at 512-306-8533.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Raymond M. Galasso, Reg. No. 37,832

Dated: November 19, 2007

Correspondence Address:

Alcatel Lucent
Intellectual Property & Standards
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075